

change in our country, as long as our cost of production remains relatively low.

The reason they will not say this is that they want their competitiveness in the world economy to rapidly increase compared to that of the United States. That became part of all of that debate. I, along with Senator BYRD and Senator HAGEL, some years ago developed a resolution that got 95 votes in the Senate suggesting that this country ought not go it alone when it came to climate change, and it certainly ought not proceed without good science; and we ought to build the systems that produce the science that allow those of us who shape public policy to make decisions based on the best science—I am talking lab science, not political science.

The climate change debate has been a good deal about the politics of the environment rather than the reality of the change itself, or what is producing the change and the science involved. This administration has said: Let's err on the side of science. Let's make sure we have an ambitious effort to get where we need to get, relating to climate change. We are not going to ignore it. We are going to be sensitive to it, but we are going to make sure that what we do is done right.

It just so happens that the nuclear initiative I have just talked about fits nicely into that equation of beginning to produce more and more of our electrical power from a nonemitting fuel source. The hydrogen fuel cell vehicle concept that I am talking about is, again, another clean technology. So while we are pushing the envelope of technology, we clearly ought to be building the scientific base to be able to make the decision as to how much further our economy and our country ought to go towards zero emissions into the environment in the name of climate change.

Those are awfully important issues, and they are some this country cannot deny or sidestep. But until we have the best science available, until we are using our own modeling, based on our own supercomputers, and we are not using the modeling with the Canadian bias, or a German bias, the kind of modeling that is producing the science that we are looking at today because we don't have our own, then shame on us for not developing it, for not using our own science and our own scientists to make sure that the science from which we base our decision is the right science. As I have said, the consequence is to produce an economy in which the American worker is no longer competitive or productive as it relates to other workers around the world. If that becomes the case, we slowly put our economy and our country at a tremendous disadvantage.

The great advantage we have always had as a country is the availability of an abundant energy supply. It is from that energy supply, which in most instances costs less than a comparable

form anywhere else in the world, that we have built the greatest economy the world has ever seen, that we have put more people to work, that we have generated more wealth, and we have created a standard of living that all of us are proud of, and that we have provided for ourselves and our citizens truly the American dream.

Was it all based on energy? It all was based on the availability of energy as a major component of that industrial base, that economic base. It was certainly also based on the free market system and the competitive character of that and the innovation that occurred through that. But along the way, Government effectively used itself and the resources of the American taxpayer to push the technology, lift the horizons of experimentation that, in a way, ultimately brought that to the ground for use by the consuming public and to be generated in the private sector.

That is what S. 14, in large part, is about. It is about the grand, new designs of new concepts that deal with large production. It is about the grand, new utilization of wind turbines and photovoltaics, and certainly the type of energy that is extremely clean and can provide a portion of energy to our energy basket. It is about making our current forms of energy even cleaner by advancing the technologies available, to give the tax incentives to effectively use the regulatory device to do so, and also not to deny ourselves the continued production of energy from our public lands and resources, and to do so in clean, environmentally sound ways that we now have the technology to utilize, because we pioneered it.

The world uses our technology today to produce clean energy. We are denying ourselves the use of our own talent. This very comprehensive energy bill will advance our cause as a country in the world, and in the area of energy technology dramatically. That which we produce for ourselves is also available to the rest of the world. It is not nor should it ever be ignored that even in China today, as it works to build new energy technologies, it is using the technology that we developed to produce energy for itself. Now we are wanting to push that envelope of technology even further, in a more aggressive approach that is environmentally benign and clean and productive for our general economy.

So a good deal of work has gone into the legislation. Now we will work our will on the floor of the Senate with different amendments that compete with some of the concepts I have talked about and, in some instances, would like to deny them altogether. We will vote it, I hope, up or down within the next few weeks. I believe it will pass and we will move it to a conference with the House and then ultimately to the President's desk. All of that happens when the President signs this into law and public policy.

I think the Senate and the Congress of the 108th can be proud of the work it has done on this energy bill. We can look forward into the future for generations of Americans and say we have redesigned the foundation, reshaped the context of a national energy strategy for our country. As this policy is implemented, it will allow that continuation of an abundant supply of a variety of forms of energy that in the past, today, and in the future will feed an ever-growing economy that continues to grant the average American citizen access to the American dream. That is what we are about. That is what good public policy ought to be about.

I believe S. 14 embodies a great deal of that.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROTOCOL FOR NATO

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, we are still in morning business. I note that no other colleagues are yet on the floor. I will speak again in morning business, but only briefly this time, as it relates to the issue before us and the protocol for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the ascendancy to that organization of Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia.

As we began to expand NATO a good number of years ago, I had voted against some of the early expansions because I did not think we had yet effectively designed our role in a post-cold-war era and a post-Soviet Union era and about the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as it relates to what it would be doing in the future. As we have seen that role adjust and change over the last several years, certainly the activity in the Balkans and the ability of NATO to participate there in bringing stability to that region has played an increasing role.

I have also been concerned that as NATO grew, we effectively changed our posture there and, in fact, even reduced some of our presence there.

I had the opportunity during the Easter break to travel to Romania. Romania, in a few years, will be eligible for and will make application for entry into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. With the growth and development of the European Union and, of course, NATO itself, it is important, I believe, that we continue to expand its role and reshape its presence on the European Continent.

We will have before us Executive Calendar No. 6, Treaty Document 108-04, bringing these countries in to NATO

which is an important expression on the part of this country of support of these countries. They are struggling mightily as they emerge from behind the Iron Curtain, as new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe shaping their own economies, to put their people to work, to assume their role in the European Community.

Many of these emerging countries, new democracies, were also very supportive of the coalition of Great Britain, Spain, and the United States in our recent effort in Iraq. They recognize the importance of stability. They also were the subject of a form of dictatorship in communism and control and their disappearance behind the Iron Curtain and within the Soviet Union for over 45 years. They appreciate the right of free people to shape their countries and their economies, probably more so than any other country around the globe today because they are newly freed nations.

I think it is important, in dealing with this effectively, as we debate it this afternoon and tomorrow, to understand that it is a role we play in cooperation with the European Community today and we will continue to have a strong role in NATO, but one that I think deserves to be redefined as the new emerging democracies of Europe become members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I am very excited about the opportunity for them. I was extremely excited to see what they are doing in Romania today and the hard work that is going on there to shape a new country, to build an economy, and to get their people back to work and out from under the old government bureaucracies of communism, and to recognize there really is a marketplace and there really is representative government and that free people can be phenomenally inventive, creative, and geniuses when they are free to the market, free to the profit incentive.

Romania clearly has that opportunity. I was over there on a different mission than to deal with NATO. I was there on a mission for children. I am the chairman of the Congressional Coalition on the Adoption Institute. As Romania was emerging, we know there were a good number of accusations over the past years, following the dictatorship of Ceausescu and when the world got a chance to see inside Romania, about how they were handling their orphans and children who had no families.

I began to work through the Adoption Institute for the ratification of the Hague Treaty which developed an international protocol that all nations we hope will conform to as to how they deal with their children and how they deal with intercountry adoption within a process that makes it transparent, legitimate, and legal so there is no trafficking of children.

Romania has been accused of such activity. As a result of that, the President of Romania and their parliament

decided to put a moratorium on intercountry adoption for a time. It caught a number of Americans who were in the process of adopting Romanian children midstream in those adoptions. They are working very hard at this moment, if you will, to clean up their act. They have excellent people working now to reform the whole of child care in Romania. We saw great examples of that.

They are also working to make sure they are in full compliance with the protocol of the Hague Treaty and to build a transparency into the system and to effectively register the agencies that function in the areas of adoption.

In the course of all of that discussion, and in visiting with nearly all of the elected officials of Romania, certainly the president, the prime minister, defense ministers, and others, they recognize all of these issues go hand in glove as they emerge into an environment where they can become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and ultimately a member of the European Union. Of course, for them and for their country, their economy, and their citizenry, this is an ever-important process, an important march and journey that the country of Romania is on.

That is certainly true in the broad sense of all of the countries I just mentioned that are now looking for acceptance into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It is important we speak to that. A good deal more will be said certainly by Senators WARNER, LEVIN, ROBERTS and others, along with Senator DODD, as we deal with this issue and vote on this particular Executive Calendar number.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DOUBLE TAXATION

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, since we are still in morning business, I will speak a few more moments until another of my colleagues asks for time.

Because it is time sensitive, I thought I would talk for a few moments about the issue of double taxation of dividends that is currently before our Finance Committee and certainly is a major component of our President's stimulus package.

Some weeks ago, before the Special Committee on Aging that I chair, we looked at this issue as it relates to older Americans. I found it fascinating that 71 percent of all taxable cash dividends are received by Americans age 55 and older. Dividend income benefits older workers and seniors who worked very hard throughout their working life, sacrificed, saved, and invested in

stocks, and in their senior years were most assuredly concerned that those stocks were dividend producers.

Unfortunately, dividend income is taxed twice—we know that—once at the company level and then again at the individual level. In effect, it certainly punishes older Americans for taking personal responsibility in their lives to save and build a little nest egg as a part of their total retirement.

This pie chart demonstrates that very clearly. Dividend penalties are received by more than half of all of our seniors. This pie chart shows that 52 percent of seniors receive taxable dividends. Nine million seniors are age 65 and older, many on fixed incomes, and rely on a little dividend income. The average dividend income for these seniors is over \$4,000 a year, and that is very significant to a retired person living on a fixed income.

That is one of the reasons our President put this idea forth. But it is only one reason. The economists who we had before the Special Committee on Aging talked about a lot of other issues embodied in this concept.

When our President first proposed it, there were a good many who said: Why this? How could this be stimulative to the economy? As those critics began to examine what our President proposed and put it in a computer model to see what kind of stimulative effect it might have, they began to recognize that it might have considerable effects.

Economists are now suggesting it would reduce the cost of business investment by 10 to 25 percent. In other words, the cost of capital that businesses require to build plants and create jobs could be reduced by as much as 25 percent. And, in fact, they would be removed from basically a 71-percent net tax bracket in which dividends or profits of corporations find themselves.

I find it interesting that we are the country of the free enterprise system, we are the country of big business, in which the rest of the world wants to invest, generating and creating the jobs on which so many of our workers depend—and at the same time we tax our profits from these businesses at nearly 71 percent. We tax them in combination twice, once at the corporate level and once at the individual level.

We are now beginning to find increased business investment that would result and have a tremendous stimulative effect on our economy and would boost the technology side of spending in our country. That is one of the very areas that help is so directly needed.

Most technology companies depend on purchases made by the industries most likely to pay dividends. It is the growth generating effect of the two in combination that is so important. These industries include manufacturing, banking, insurance, transportation, communications, and other sectors. All of them currently are flat or growing very slowly.